DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 262 108 TM 850 630

AUTHOR D'Amico, Joseph J.; Dawson, Judith A.
TITLE Cooperation or Cooptation? The Benefits and Limitations of Involving Program Developers in Program Evaluation.
PUB DATE Mar 85
NOTE 21p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adoption (Ideas); *Cooperative Programs; Data Analysis; Data Collection; Data Interpretation; Educational Assessment; Educational Development; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Methods; *Evaluation Utilization; *Formative Evaluation; Participative Decisionmaking; Program Development; *Program Evaluation; Research Design
IDENTIFIERS Evaluation Problems; New Jersey; Qualitative Research; *School Effectiveness Training Project; *Secondary School Development Program

ABSTRACT

In 1981, the developers of a school-based change effort engaged researchers to conduct an evaluation study employing qualitative methodology that would provide the developers with information that could be used to improve the program. Resource constraints, short timelines, and the developers' preference for useable information encouraged researchers to adopt a research approach that emphasized quick turnaround and client-centered feedback strategies and that also utilized developers in data gathering and analysis activities. This paper describes the evaluation study in more detail with special emphasis on the issues raised by using a research strategy in which developers participate in design formulation, data collection, and analysis. It outlines a number of benefits such as accelerating data use by clients, broadening of the data base, increasing the influence of the data, and reducing study costs. And it discusses several limitations of such a strategy, including: cooptation of researchers or developers; threats to the integrity and objectivity of research information, and reductions in the quality of the research activities and data. (Author/LMO)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED262108

Cooperation or Cooptation? The Benefits and Limitations of Involving Program Developers in Program Evaluation

Joseph J. D'Amico
Judith A. Dawson

Research for Better Schools, Inc.
444 North Third Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19123

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Chapman, M. L.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- ✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

TM 850 630

Cooperation or Cooptation?
The Benefits and Limitations of
Involving Program Developers in
Program Evaluation

Abstract

In 1981, the developers of a school-based change effort engaged researchers to conduct an evaluation study employing qualitative methodology that would provide the developers with information that could be used to improve the program. Resource constraints, short timelines, and the developers' preference for useable information encouraged researchers to adopt a somewhat unusual research approach -- one that emphasizes quick turnaround and client-centered feedback strategies and that also utilizes developers in data gathering and analysis activities.

This paper describes the evaluation study in more detail with special emphasis on the issues raised by using a research strategy in which developers participate in design formulation, data collection, and analysis. It outlines a number of benefits such as accelerating data use by clients, broadening of the data base, increasing the influence of the data, and reducing study costs. And it discusses several limitations of such a strategy: cooptation of researchers or developers, threats to the integrity and objectivity of research information, reductions in the quality of the research activities and data, and the like.

The use of evaluation findings for program improvement has been a theme in evaluation literature for nearly 20 years. In contrast to their early expectations that evaluation studies would provide a significant portion of the knowledge base that policy makers would consider when undertaking important decisions about a program, evaluators have adopted a more realistic view of how much evaluation, in fact, is used and how it is used in decision making. They now see that many factors other than formal inquiry (for example, practical and political considerations, human biases, or common sense knowledge) often strongly influence the directions that programs take (Kennedy, 1984; Lindblom & Cohen, 1979; Weiss, 1980). Evaluators also now recognize that "use" can be a relative concept and that different levels of information use occur -- from altering perceptions of a program, to influencing major decisions about it (Alkin, Daillak, & White, 1979). And they have identified several strategies for enhancing knowledge use, one of which is to deliberately involve potential information users such as clients, sponsors, and other audiences in evaluation studies (for example, Gold, 1983; Stake, 1975).

In this paper we shall take a closer look at the information use issue as we describe how one evaluation study, employing user participation, has enhanced knowledge utilization and, in fact, has influenced program decisions. We begin with a brief discussion of the viability of user participation as an evaluation strategy with special attention to its potential for increasing the use of evaluation information. We illustrate this discussion with a description of our own evaluation study and our

experiences involving program staff in it. We then outline a number of program changes that we feel resulted from an increased use of evaluation information by program staff. Finally, in an analysis of this situation, we seek to answer the questions: "Why were program staff so receptive to the information generated by the evaluation study?" and "Why did they use it so readily to revise the programs?"

Knowledge Use in Evaluation

As Ernest House noted, "Producing data is one thing: getting it used is quite another" (1973, p. 133). This sentiment describes a major, chronic dilemma of evaluators. As far back as the middle '60s both Guba (1968) and Stufflebeam (1967) noted that evaluation information is often seen as useless and irrelevant to decision makers. Since then knowledge use -- or non use -- has been documented quite diligently by evaluators and policy researchers (for example, Alkin, Daillak, & White, 1979; Deshpande & Zaltman, 1983; Florio, Behrman, & Goltz, 1979; Leviton, & Hughes, 1981; Weiss & Bucuvalas, 1980). This attention has improved our understanding of the problem of information non use, its causes, and how it might be overcome. One strategy that a number of authors suggest to increase knowledge use is to involve clients or others in evaluation activities.

In examining the impact of health evaluation research, Patton and his colleagues (Patton, Grimes, Guthrie, Brennan, French, & Blyth, 1975) discovered that evaluation information probably <u>does</u> get used by decision makers. They suggest, however, that it is only one of a number of pieces of information that influence decisions and it often competes with other considerations, which Patton and his colleagues label "political" and

"personal." These authors see the personal considerations as the most interesting for they seem to be more susceptible to evaluator influence. These personal considerations include general low commitment and lack of enthusiasm for using evaluation information and low regard for the evaluator or evaluation design.

In reviewing the research of Patton and his colleagues as well as many others, Leviton and Hughes (1981) describe clusters of variables associated with these personal considerations that they feel could enhance a client's use of information. These clusters are: relevance of the information for program concerns, effectiveness of communication, ease with which the clients process the information, credibility of the information, and a key actor's (client, manager, or developer) involvement and advocacy for using the information.

More recently, Kennedy (1984) and McLaughlin (1984) have zeroed in on similar considerations noting that potential users may reconceptualize, incorrectly interpret, or even disregard evaluation information if it is not expressed in their terms or linked to their experiences. Both authors also stress the importance of making potential users comfortable with evaluation information as well as the importance of making that information relevant.

Leviton and Hughes (1981) suggest that client involvement in research studies is an effective way to make users comfortable with evaluation information, while making it relevant for them, and thereby enhancing their use of the information. They argue that by involving clients in study activities, evaluators stand a better chance of relating research information to user experiences, needs, and concerns; of making sure the

information is communicated smoothly and efficiently; of helping users recognize its usefulness; of keeping their own and the evaluator's credibility high; and of gaining the advocacy and involvement of a key actor.

Client involvement in evaluation and policy research studies is not a unique idea. Two evaluation approaches, one described by Stake (1975) and one by Gold (1983), explicitly call for user involvement at several stages of the evaluation process. Stake's approach, which he labels "responsive" evaluation, calls for the evaluator to consult users and try to incorporate their interests and values into the study design. He also recommends that their reactions to report drafts be solicited and, whenever possible, they be consulted in the interim. Gold goes even farther in his "stakeholder" approach. According to him, the evaluator should adhere to user (stakeholder) preferences -- in effect, work for the stakeholders, who specify what kinds of information they want and in what form. Client participation also has been advocated by Ballard and James (1983) and Leitko and Peterson (1982). The former suggest several participation strategies including using advisory committees, circulating report drafts, interacting verbally and in writing, and disseminating research products. Leitko and Peterson go beyond Ballard and James by advocating that clients actually be involved in research decision making.

Given the findings and recommendations of these authors, it seems that involving potential users in evaluation activities might be an effective way to overcome some barriers to knowledge use. First, it might help clients understand research activities more fully than if they were not involved. Second, it might make them more aware of the relevance, credibility, and

value of the evaluation information -- particularly if they helped generate it. Third, it might improve their communication with evaluators. Fourth, it might cause them to become advocates of the evaluation process. Fifth, and most important, it might enable the clients to process the information more quickly and easily and use it more effectively in decision making.

We have had the opportunity to test some of these hypotheses and suggestions about client involvement in the course of our documentation and evaluation of two school improvement programs, School Effectiveness Training and the Secondary School Development Program. Both are cooperative efforts involving staff from Research for Better Schools, Inc. (RBS), from local and state teachers' associations, and from schools and school districts in Pennsylvania and New Jersey. The clients we have involved in our study of these programs are RBS staff who developed the programs and provide technical assistance to schools implementing them.

The SET/SSDP Programs

School Effectiveness Training (SET) and the Secondary School Development Program (SSDP) are designed to help urban school staff and administrators establish processes that will enable them to work collaboratively toward organizational improvement in their schools. The programs, which were developed by RBS and the New Jersey Education Association (NJEA), are based on the premise that schools can become more effective by making better use of their human resources, by opening up the decision-making process to all staff members, and by focusing their improvement efforts on a few critical areas at a time. The developers' goals for schools that embark upon the SET or SSDP processes include higher staff morale, improved

communication, better working relationships among teaching staff and between teachers and administrators, improved learning environments, and finally, increased academic achievement among students. Through these programs, schools form coordinating councils that include representatives of the teaching, administrative, and support staffs. These councils, similar to labor-management councils in private industry, work through task groups to identify priority areas for school improvement and to develop -- and later implement -- plans for addressing these areas.

Both programs include an evaluation component, staffed by RBS evaluators. The study's major mission is to provide information that RBS and the NJEA can use to improve the SET/SSDP programs and to explain the programs' operations to others. This paper focuses on the evaluation study's program improvement function which -- as will be seen -- has resulted in modifications to the programs that apply both as the programs are introduced in new sites and as adjustments in on-going sites.

The Evaluation Study

The evaluation study of SET and SSDP is designed to maximize its utility for program improvement. The design is guided by two general perspectives. The first emphasizes knowledge use. The evaluators recognize that lack of utilization is a pervasive problem in program evaluation. Furthermore, they believe that one criterion of an evaluation study's effectiveness is its utility. Unless study findings are used, they cannot contribute to program improvement. Two particular suggestions from the literature on utilization outlined earlier are incorporated into the study design. They are the reliance on qualitative methods of inquiry and

the involvement of program development and technical assistance staff in evaluation study activities.

The second design perspective is that of planned change. The SET and SSDP programs involve introducing changes in schools. The evaluators believe that by incorporating a planned change perspective the study will provide the most useful information for program improvement. Therefore, the study includes variables identified by previous researchers as influencing the process of developing and implementing new educational programs (for example, Corbett, Dawson, & Firestone, 1984; Fullan, 1982; Lehming & Kane, 1981).

The evaluation study of SET and SSDP is primarily a qualitative one. Data are collected through semi-structured interviewing and observation. Program and school staff are interviewed several times each year. In addition, evaluators observe program-related activities, which include orientation and training sessions, coordinating council meetings, discussions between RBS and district staff, inservice sessions, and RBS planning meetings. During each data collection activity, evaluators are guided by broad lists of questions or categories of information. Data are later recorded as field notes. Other evaluation methods include analysis of information from surveys, program and school documents (program materials, meeting minutes, and newsletters, for example), and school records (test scores, student and teacher attendance rates, and the like).

The program staff who are involved in the evaluation study are RBS employees who helped design the SET and SSDP programs and who continue to modify and refine them, who provide training for teachers and administrators, and who provide technical assistance to help smooth program implementation.

Some program staff are involved as direct participants in the study. During most of the evaluation study's three years, one or two program staff members have been assigned to it as active, direct participants. Initially, two field agents -- whose primary program roles were to help develop materials and provide technical assistance to school-level participants -- helped with data collection. They accompanied the evaluator to sites, interviewed teachers, and prepared written field notes. Later, another staff member (the senior author) became a full participant in the study, contributing to design, data collection, and feedback activities.

Beyond this direct participation, other program staff members (including the director) are involved less directly but nonetheless deliberately and extensively in the study. Most of this involvement is related to data analysis or feedback activities. These activities involve staff in the evaluation study in that they stimulate and encourage two-way communication and interaction between the evaluators and the staff members. The involvement techniques are:

Debriefing sessions -- These are of two types: (1) After visiting a particular site, evaluators usually give informal feedback specific to the site visit to the staff members responsible for program operations in that site. (2) Evaluators ask staff members to describe events the evaluators do not attend as well as other personal or telephone contacts with sites.

Joint site visits -- Program staff and evaluators often attend onsite program development sessions or other project meetings together and compare notes about what happened.

Field notes -- Field notes, which are edited to protect informant anonymity, are sometimes shared and discussed with individual staff members.

Informal interaction -- Evaluators and program staff sometimes exchange general information about sites during brief, spontaneous interactions (over lunch, for example) in their workplace.

Feedback meetings -- Evaluation findings relevant to all sites and their program implications are discussed during formal meetings convened specifically to present recent information. Findings also are discussed during routine staff or other meetings.

Written statements -- After completing a round of interviews or otherwise collecting data from all sites, evaluators sometimes prepare written memos presenting tentative findings.

Formal reports -- Formal evaluation reports are written annually and distributed to staff members in draft form.

Potential Risks

Although we have found these staff involvement strategies have many benefits for us as evaluators -- including increased use of study findings, as will be discussed later -- they also have potential risks. So far, in contrast to the benefits, the risks are relatively hypothetical. They are disadvantages which we think could have occurred but whose negative impacts are so slight thus far that we prefer to label them "risks."

One major risk is cooptation of evaluators or developers. For instance, evaluators may avoid threatening issues, equivocate negative reports, or generally be less than candid in order to protect their relationships with developer participants. Program development staff, on the other hand, may rely too heavily on information they feel they have helped generate -- for example, by accepting and acting on evaluators' analyses or recommendations without reviewing them critically. To a minor degree some cooptation of this sort may be occurring in this study, but our impression is that to date there have been no serious consequences.

Another related risk has to do with the integrity of the study. When evaluators emphasize collecting information that is useful to ongoing program operations, they may neglect background information (whose

immediate utility is not apparent) which could become important to understanding how a program evolves in a particular school. That has occurred some in this study, but we feel it has resulted as much from the lack of sufficient resources for the study as it has from the study's focus on utility. Furthermore, the evaluators are aware of the importance of background information and attempt to collect it at every opportunity. So, this has not been a serious problem -- although it remains to be seen if the program might have benefited had more comprehensive background information been collected sooner.

Another, more serious, risk to a study's integrity is that program development staff who participate actively may replace evaluation personnel. This may influence the nature and quality of evaluation activities. Program developers often have relatively little training in evaluation methods. Also, their status may be higher or lower than that of evaluation personnel they replaced. Consequently, technical aspects of evaluation activities may be deemphasized, tedious tasks -- such as those associated with compiling quantitative data -- may be eliminated, and the quality of data collection and analysis may suffer. To some extent, this study has been influenced by the level of evaluation expertise and the status of participating program development staff members. Quantitative activities have been neglected. Some field notes have been cryptic. A report draft contained statements that went beyond the data. For the most part, however, the evaluation study has proved sufficiently flexible to adapt to the type of assistance available, for instance by reducing the use of quantitative information. And so far, this direction has been

compatible with the staff's information needs. Also helping to minimize this risk is one direct participant's training in anthropology and consequent understanding of the goals and techniques of qualitative methods of inquiry.

Another risk of involving program staff in evaluation activities is the imposition that it makes on their time and priorities. In this instance, staff involvement in evaluation takes time away from their developing or assisting in the field tasks as they learn new skills or conduct evaluation activities. It also means wearing two hats and, in some cases, reconciling value conflicts -- whether to approach a situation as an evaluator or a developer or a field assistor. So far, no one has complained too loudly about these impositions. More extensive program staff involvement and the extra responsibilities it would bring with it would likely cause a change, however.

Benefits

The participation of program staff in the evaluation study has benefited the study itself, the program and its staff, and program clients at the district and school site level. One of the major benefits, the one which is the topic of this paper, has been an increase in the use of information generated from the study. Other benefits, which will be discussed first, are that costs have been reduced and that the study itself has been enriched.

It appears that evaluation study costs have been reduced because additional data are generated through staff participation without the expense of hiring extra evaluation personnel, although estimating precise savings is a complex task. There have been some costs associated with

direct participation -- in which program staff conduct evaluation activities such as interviewing teachers or observing meetings -- because other work has been displaced and the salaries of program staff are probably higher than those of staff who would otherwise be hired to assist with evaluation activities. Those costs seem to be offset by the program director's assignment of lower priority to the work that was displaced than to the evaluation study activities, and by the avoidance of the start-up, orientation and training costs of hiring someone new. Indirect participation has not required enough time of program development staff to displace other work, so it has expanded the data base at virtually no expense.

Staff participation has enriched the evaluation study for several reasons. First, of course, it has simply enlarged the data base. Second, characteristics of the people involved -- namely, the backgrounds and perspectives of the program staff members -- have enhanced their contributions to the study. Two of the direct participants have been involved in many previous, similar efforts to develop and implement new programs in schools. They understand the process of change and are quick to identify factors that facilitate or hinder program-related changes in individual sites. A third has helped develop program procedures and materials, is very familiar with both programs, and knows what questions to ask about them. The staff members who participate less directly also have varied perspectives -- in organizational development and adolescent development, for example -- and these perspectives have helped enrich the study. Third, the way in which the staff participation strategy is being enacted -- primarily its interactive quality -- has enriched the study. As

program staff and evaluators have discussed their observations, experiences, and reactions the portraits of the programs and of their operationalization in individual schools have become fuller and more complex.

Information Use and Program Changes

During the evaluation study's three years, we have observed program development and assistance staff introduce many modifications. Moreover, we believe the evaluation study has influenced many of those changes, although its contribution cannot always be distinguished from that of other sources of influence. For example, the frequent informal interaction sometimes makes it difficult for staff to recall what information they obtained independently, from each other, or from the evaluators. Also, program and evaluation staff may both contribute information that allows them to piece together a description or interpretation of events in a site. And, many program changes have been made for multiple reasons, some that were related to the evaluation study and some that were not.

Despite these difficulties, we can point to several indications that the evaluation study has contributed to program improvement. First, some information that led to program changes was available only through the study. Other information that led to changes emerged as themes that recurred during formal and informal evaluation feedback. Finally, evaluators were sometimes present when program modifications were made or incorporated into onsite activities; we observed staff use evaluation information that had been communicated to them recently.

For us, the increased use of evaluation information became evident soon after staff participation began. From the start, program staff members' data collection activities in schools and their interviews with teachers alerted them to assistance needs in individual sites as well as to program adjustments that would facilitate introduction into new schools. Likewise, they became aware of needed changes almost from the first debriefing sessions. And they began making modifications in response. This accelerated use of evaluation information has continued throughout the duration of staff participation, although it seems to have been heaviest during the early developmental stages of the program. We turn now to the program changes themselves and later we will analyze the reasons why we think staff participation in the evaluation study contributed to those changes.

Conceptual Changes

The evaluation study has changed some aspects of the developers' conceptualization of the program. Through their use of evaluation information we saw developers come to realize that it would take longer than initially anticipated to instigate changes in schools, particularly changes that would have an impact on student performance and behavior. Evaluation information also helped make them aware that school staff would need more follow-up assistance than originally expected. Likewise, developers learned that an exclusively grassroots approach would not work in all schools. In secondary sites in particular, it was shown that teachers could not introduce changes by themselves without the active involvement and assistance of administrators. Another change in program conceptualization brought on by developers' use of evaluation information

was the recognition that schools needed flexibility in identifying issues to be pursued through the program. Specifically, initial conceptual links to Edmonds' (1981) factors of school effectiveness proved to be too limiting to program implementation.

Operational Changes

These conceptual changes led to numerous operational changes. Field agents began to spend more time in sites, providing more follow-up assistance. They sought to ensure that their involvement would extend over a several-year period. They developed special materials to instruct school staff in program procedures and program-related skills. They held cross-site seminars where they provided additional technical assistance. They introduced annual intensive training sessions for coordinating councils. Developers also began to work more closely with administrators, consulting with them during the first program adoption sessions. They continued to elicit administrators' support and advised them to provide specific types of assistance such as time for planning and formal approval of council recommendations. In an attempt to introduce flexibility into the process of selecting issues, developers urged schools to establish sub-groups beyond ones determined by Edmonds' five factors, and, in fact, to move from standing "factor" groups to temporary "task" groups.

In sum, evaluation information helped cause program developers to modify their initial conceptualization of the programs along several lines. This, in turn, led to changes in the way program staff assisted site personnel and changes in the way the programs were carried out in the schools.

Cooperation or Cooptation?

Anxiety over cooptation is an evaluation cliche. On the other hand, anxiety over limited resources and the lack of client use of evaluation information are evaluation realities. In our study of the SET and SSDP programs, we have been able to broaden our data base as well as maximize our use of scarce resources and our client's use of the information we generate. We also have been able to avoid the risks of serious cooptation so far. And we predict that we will continue to be able to avoid them. In our opinion, our strategy of involving program developers in program evaluation has contributed to our success on the first count. As for avoiding cooptation, we believe that a combination of factors have contributed to our success in that regard:

- Our clients are colleagues who understand evaluation and recognize the importance of evaluator independence.
- All of us are genuinely concerned with program effectiveness and all are willing to work to make SET and SSDP as effective as possible.
- We have a good working relationship with the developers; everyone's roles and responsibilities are clearly spelled out and honored.
- Our evaluation information goes to the developers--not a third party who makes funding or continuation decisions.

In conclusion, having weighed the benefits and risks of involving program staff in evaluation studies, we believe that it has been a very worthwhile strategy so far for this study. Evaluation findings have influenced program improvement decisions and evaluators and developers have

enjoyed a fruitful cooperative relationship. At the same time, cooptation has been minimal and the study's integrity has not been compromised seriously.

We wish to reemphasize, however, that a number of situational factors facilitated this involvement and worked to minimize the risks. We recognize that many evaluators are not in situations which will permit as much involvement as easily as was the case in this study. Yet we feel that the benefits noted will accrue if concerted efforts are made to increase client and staff participation. Depending on the situation, these efforts should focus on audience members who are in a position to use the information: policy makers, developers, administrators, and the like. We found that simply interacting with program staff and administrators to increase their knowledge of the study has a tremendous positive impact on their sense of involvement in and commitment to it.

With the caveats noted, we would recommend that this strategy of involving program staff be considered for other evaluation studies. For us, it has had high pay offs in enlarging the data base, increasing knowledge use, and improving the programs--all at a relatively low cost.

References

Alkin, M.C., Daillak, R., & White, P. (1979). Using evaluations: Does evaluation make a difference? Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Ballard, S.C., & James, T.E. (1983). Participatory research and utilization in the technology assessment process: Issues and recommendations. Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization, 4(3), 409-427.

Corbett, H.D., Dawson, J.A., & Firestone, A. W. (1984). School context and school change: Implications for effective planning. New York: Teacher's College Press.

Deshpande, R., & Zaltman, G. (1983). Patterns of research use in private and public sectors. Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization, 4(4), 561-575.

Edmonds, R. (1981). The characteristics of effective schools: Research and implementation. Unpublished manuscript, Michigan State University.

Florio, D.H., Behrman, M.M., & Goltz, P.L. (1979). What do policy makers think of educational research and evaluation? Or do they? Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 1(6), 61-87.

Fullan, M. (1982). The meaning of educational change. New York: Teachers College Press.

Gold, N. (198). Stakeholder and program evaluation: Characterizations and reflections. In A.S. Bryk (Ed.), Stakeholder-based evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Guba, E. G. (1968). Development, diffusion, and evaluation. In T. L. Eidell & J. M. Kitehel (Eds.), Knowledge production and utilization in educational administration. Eugene, OR: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration.

House, E. R. (1973). The conscience of educational evaluation. In E. R. House (Ed.), School evaluation: The politics and process. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing.

Kennedy, M.M. (1984). How evidence alters understanding. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis. 6(3). 207-226

Lehming, R., & Kane, M. (1981). Improving schools: Using what we know. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.